DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 226 UD 016 208

AUTHOR Miller, A. R.
TITLE The Black Migrant: Changing Origins, Changing Characteristics.
INSTITUTION Atlanta Univ., Ga.
SPONS AGENCY Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Oct 74
CONTRACT DLMA-21-42-73-41
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the W.E.B. DuBois Institute for the Study of the American Black (Atlanta, Georgia, October 1974); Some of the tabular material will not reproduce legibly
AVAILABLE FROM Atlanta University, 223 Chestnut Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30313 ($1.50)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Age; Black Community; *Change Agents; Change Strategies; Educational Background; *Individual Characteristics; *Metropolitan Areas; Migrants; *Migration; *Migration Patterns; Negro Culture; *Negroes; Negro Population Trends; Occupational Information; Social Status; Urban Immigration

ABSTRACT

The character of black migration, as well as the significance that migration will play in the future of the black population is examined in this paper. Section I of the paper presents an introduction. Section II addresses recent migration to metropolitan areas, focusing on the origins of recent migrants, characteristics of recent migrants (age, education, activity, status, and occupation), and a summary. This section of the paper notes that black migrants to metropolitan areas now come predominantly from other metropolitan areas and that the major stream of black migration is now from one metropolitan area to another. It is also noted that the description of the average black migrant to the city as an ill-trained person of rural background and low socioeconomic status to whom the social problems of the large metropolitan areas can be largely attributed will not hold. He or she is in fact well educated by current standards and, judging from the occupational position of those employed, relatively successful at utilizing this education. Section III discusses interstate migration and multiple movers. It seems clear from the evidence of the 1970 census, that the black population of the United States is now in a third stage--when the rural to urban shift has proceeded to the point where in fact it is a relatively small part of total migration and when perhaps the differences in educational opportunities between city and country have diminished. (Author/AM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED126226

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Black Migrant: Changing Origins, Changing Characteristics

A.R. Miller

Paper to be presented to W.E.B. DuBois Conference on the American Black, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia, October 1974

The research reported in this paper was financed in part under a grant from the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor (contract number 21-42-73-41).

UD 016 208

I. Introduction 1

II. Recent migration to metropolitan areas 5

1. Origins of recent migrants 5

2. Characteristics of recent migrants 9

a. Age 9

b. Education 11

c. Activity status and occupation 14

3. Summary 18

III. Interstate migration and "multiple movers" 20

IV. Conclusions and implications 22

I. Introduction

The Census of Population taken in 1900, shortly after DuBois published his landmark study, shows three metropolitan areas with over 100,000 black residents, one in the north, Philadelphia, and two in the border area of the South, the District of Columbia and Baltimore. Seventy years later, at the most recent census, 34 metropolitan areas had 100,000 or more black inhabitants, and of these, two had well over 1,000,000. In the interim, a population that was nearly 80 percent rural at the initial date had become over 80 percent urban by the closing date (Appendix Table I.). This may very well be the most rapid and extensive shift experienced by any large population group in modern history. And it was achieved largely by migration, that is, by the movement of individuals, primarily young adults, away from their places of birth and childhood associations to a social and economic environment that could not be in greater contrast to their early lives.

The movement from rural to urban areas is, of course, a world wide phenomenon and has been an important characteristic of populations in Western Europe and North America for at least a century and a half. What I believe is unique up to the present in the experience of the black population in the United States is the rapidity of this shift and the fact that so large a proportion of the movement took place over long distances.

Demographers, dependent as we usually are on aggregate statistics, can only be envious of DuBois' opportunity to investigate in detail the sources and consequences of migration to the city of Philadelphia. In his study he notes that much of the migration is "indirect; Negroes come from country districts to small towns; then go to larger towns; eventually they drift to Norfolk, Va., or to Richmond.

Next they come to Washington, and finally settle in Baltimore or Philadelphia."[1] The raw data that we have available to study the general movement out of the rural South, and the estimates derived from these data, do not make it possible for us to know how much of the migration taking place in the past was of the type described by DuBois, with Southern urban areas providing "way stations" to migrants from rural areas who then moved on to the North in what is known as "step migration." Indeed, we do not even know the total volume of migration since, up until very recent times, we are dependent on estimates of "net" migration, that is. on figures that show only an estimated balance between those who left a state and those who came to it over the ten year period between censuses. But DuBois' analysis of the situation with regard to the "indirect" nature of migration to Philadelphia is in accord with our knowledge of the behavior of migrants in general, and finds support in some of the evidence we have for the more recent period when somewhat more direct measures are available.

Although the estimates of net intercensal migration cannot tell us whether what DuBois found in Philadelphia in the late nineteenth century continued to be true through the period of the mass migrations in the 20th century, these estimates, prepared and analyzed by Drs. Everett Lee and Hope Eldridge,[2] do provide an invaluable source of information from which many inferences on the nature of migration in the first half of this century can be drawn. If the predominantly rural vs. urban origins of migrants from the South to the North in the early decades of this century remain unclear, the evidence of the urban character of their destinations presented by the Lee-Eldridge series is unambiguous. All of the non-Southern states that have been the recipients of significant numbers of black migrants have had black populations that were predominantly urban at every census in this century and in most cases the proportions have been overwhelmingly urban. What the Lee-

Eldridge data also show, however, and what has perhaps been less widely recognized, is the extent of the apparently permanent rural-urban shift of black population within the South itself throughout this period. Because of the rapid industrialization of the South in the post World War II period, is has often been assumed that the earlier urbanization of the black population occurred almost entirely in connection with the movement out of the South, and that it is only in the recent period that Southern urban areas have become an important destination for rural out-migrants. But the Lee-Eldridge data show that most urban blacks lived in the South throughout the first half of this century, and that substantial increases in the South's urban black population occurred over each intercensal period. It is not until 1960 that the majority of urban blacks were enumerated as living outside the South, and the 1960-1970 period is the first in which less than a third of the total urban increase was accounted for by the South.

A part of the growth in the urban black population in the South undoubtedly arises from natural increase - that is, the excess of births over deaths to the black population resident in urban areas - and a part arises from the reclassification of previously rural areas as density of settlement qualified them as urban. But is seems clear that in most Southern states the bulk of the growth has been accomplished by the in-migration of black population from rural areas either in their home or a neighboring state.

That there has been net out-migration of the black population from the South as a whole, and from almost every state in the region, over each intercensal period since 1900, is incontrovertible. But since 1910, this out-migration has been a "net" of a decline in rural black population so substantial as to conceal a very considerable growth in the number of urban blacks in the region. The magnitude of the numbers involved suggest that some proportion of the movement from the rural

South was probably directly to the urban North. But we do not, in fact, have any direct evidence of the extent to which urban areas of the South provided the first experience of urban living to the rural black population in the early decades.

We have so far been discussing urban areas as a whole. But life in a small urban center is certainly very different from that in the large urban agglomeration. In the remainder of this paper we will concentrate our attention primarily on those large urban agglomerations, known to the Census Bureau, and the Federal government in general, as Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, or SMSAs. These metropolitan areas, numbering 243 specific agglomerations in 1970, included three-fourths of the black population of the United States at that date, and most of this metropolitan black population - over 70 percent - lived in the 34 areas alluded to before, that is, those whose black inhabitants numbered 100,000 or more in 1970 (Appendix Tables II and III).

In looking at the growth of the black populations in these metropolitan areas, we have used a series that holds area boundaries constant in terms of their 1960 definitions for all census dates prior to 1960. This means that in the earlier periods a substantial proportion of these populations were living in areas that would have been classified as rural. So the growth of these areas cannot be directly compared with the growth of the urban population. But it is clear that the trends and direction of growth are similar for both series. For these areas, however, the dominance of the South in the total is somewhat reduced. The southern states have always been characterized by more small urban places that do not qualify for metropolitan status than has the rest of the country. Even within the metropolitan population, there are more small SMSAs in the South - the 16 southern

SMSAs with 100,000 or more black inhabitants in 1970 include only 60 percent of all metropolitan blacks in the region, whereas the 16 SMSAs in the two northern regions include over 80 percent of all northern metropolitan blacks. The increasing concentration of black population in these largest agglomerations is, however, characteristic of all four regions through 1950. Since 1950, the proportion of regional black population in the six Northeastern, ten North Central, and two Western areas falling into this group has levelled off, but in the 16 Southern areas and for the country as a whole the trend towards increasing concentration in these largest areas has continued.

DuBois' study was undertaken at a time when the vast redistribution of the black population of this country had barely begun, in a city that was probably the first of the great northern metropolises to receive substantial numbers of black migrants from the South. He found, as he says, that, as a whole, it is true, that the average of culture and wealth and social efficiency is far lower among immigrants than natives, and that this gives rise to the gravest of the Negro problems."[3] Probably his findings for Philadelphia were also applicable to the situation in other large metropolitan areas as the movement to these areas accelerated in subsequent decades.

II. Recent migration to metropolitan areas

The idea that the black migrant is an ill-trained peasant whose presence has a disrupting influence on the community has continued to dominate public discussions of this subject. It seems appropriate here to examine whether the great changes that we have just briefly outlined have, in fact, left the status and the role of the black migrant unaffected. Let us, therefore, turn our attention to the present and to what the recent Censuses can tell us about the nature of black migration and and the characteristics of black migrants.

1. Origins of recent migrants

The first thing we may note is that, whatever the situation in the past, the dominant stream with regard to type of residence for black migrants now is from one metropolitan area to another. Of the 1.6 million black persons who reported a place of residence in 1965 different from that in which they were living in 1970, 42 percent had moved between two metropolitan areas, 16 percent had moved between two nonmetropolitan areas, 14 percent had left a metropolitan area and moved to a nonmetropolitan one, and 28 percent had come to a metropolitan area from a previous nonmetropolitan residence. On the average then, about 60 percent of the migrants to metropolitan areas over the 1965-1970 interval had lived in a metropolitan area in 1965. For the six largest SMSAs, which in combination included over 25 percent of all black residents of the country in 1970, two-thirds of all in-migrants came from another metropolitan area.

Persons reporting place of residence in the United States in 1965 different from that in 1970, Black population 5 years of age and over (in thousands)

Type of residence in 1965	Type of residence in 1970		
	Total	Metropolitan	Nonmetropolitan
Total	1,640	1,147	493
Metropolitan	929	695	234
Nonmetropolitan	711	452	259

Source: same as Table 1.

Unfortunately, we do not have comparable data for all metropolitan areas in 1960, but we do have the proportions for certain specific areas, and in particular, 32 of the 34 that had over 100,000 black inhabitants in 1970 and which among them, as noted previously, contained about 70 percent of the metropolitan black population at that date. For these 32, the sharp contrast between the two censuses is striking:

with almost no exception, the proportion of in-migrants from other metropolitan areas is substantially higher in 1970 than in 1960; nineteen of the 32 received over 50 percent of in-migrants from non-metropolitan areas in 1960, while by 1970, this was true of only four. The change is particularly noteworthy among the 14 SMSAs in the South -- in 1960, in-migrants to all of them were predominantly nonmetropolitan in origin; by 1970, ten were receiving at least a slight majority of in-migrants from other metropolitan areas. As a result, the average large southern area differed somewhat less from those in the rest of the country at the later date.

Average percent of in-migrants resident in another metropolitan area 5 years prior to census (unweighted averages)

Residence at Census date	1960 (Total, except white)	1970 (Black)
All metropolitan areas	N.A.	60.6(a)
32 metropolitan areas	45.7	58.1
6 Northeastern areas	53.8	64.4
10 North Central areas	50.7	61.0
14 Southern areas	35.3	50.6
2 Western areas	70.0	77.4

Source: Appendix Table IV
(a) Weighted average

An obvious corollary of the metropolitan origin of in-migrants to metropolitan areas is that out-migrants from these areas must have predominantly metropolitan destinations, and this is, in fact, true. Three-fourths of those who left metropolitan areas went to other metropolitan areas. What is different, however, with respect to out-migrants is that for this series there is considerably less variation between 1960 and 1970, at least insofar as we can determine trends from the 32 areas for which comparison can be made. Even more interesting is the observation that here the Southern SMSAs do not, for either decade, differ as substantially from

those in the rest of the country as they do for the in-migrant series.

Average percent of out-migrants resident in metropolitan area at Census date
(unweighted averages)

Residence 5 years prior to Census	1960 (Total, except white)	1970 (Black)
All metropolitan areas	N.A.	74.8(a)
32 metropolitan areas	67.0	73.7
6 Northeastern areas	69.1	75.1
10 North Central areas	69.4	76.2
14 Southern areas	63.0	70.0
2 Western areas	76.6	84.0

Source: Appendix Table IV
(a) Weighted average

Two recent dates are perhaps not very strong evidence on which to base generalizations, and particularly since we do not at present know the specific destination of out-migrants; these data, however, do suggest that Southern metropolitan areas, as they have grown, have provided increasing proportions of the in-migrants to urban areas outside the South. Over the last decade, the cumulative effect of generations of urban-ward movement and the consequent erosion of the rural based population, had reached the point where, despite continuing high rates of migration out of the rural south, the place of origin for the majority of black migrants was a metropolitan area.

The point just noted, that rates of out-migration from rural areas continue to be high, deserves further emphasis. Very rough approximations of rates of out-migration, computed by taking persons who reported they had left a given type of area as a proportion of all those reporting they had lived in that type of area in 1965, show a very sharp inverse correlation between size of area and out-migration from it. The contrast between the six largest metropolitan areas (those with over 3,000,000 total population) and non-metropolitan areas of less than 20,000 popula-

tion, is particularly striking - less than 5 percent of those reporting a 1965 residence in the largest areas were living in a different place by 1970; whereas for the smallest areas, the proportion was over 13 percent (Table 1).

So the dramatic change in the place of origin of migrants to metropolitan areas is not the result of a higher mobility among metropolitan residents - they are still, as Ravenstein pointed out 75 years ago in an article contemporaneous with DuBois' study, less mobile than their rural brethren.[4] The change, rather, arises from the simple arithmetic of the situation. The black population is now so overwhelmingly urban, metropolitan in residence, the remaining rural, non-metropolitan pool is so small, that we can anticipate only further increases in the dominance of the intermetropolitan stream among the black migrants.

2. Characteristics of recent migrants

What is the significance of this, in terms of the character of migration and the role that migration will play in the future of the black population? At least a part of the answer lies in the characteristic differences between migrants and nonmigrants and, in particular, in the varying attributes of migrants in each of the streams within the metropolitan-nonmetropolitan matrix.

a. Age: That migrants are highly selected by age is so well established as hardly to need mention. In 1970, over 22 percent of blacks ages 20-24 reported that they had changed their place of residence since 1965, as compared to less than 4 percent of those aged 55 or more (Table 1). Those aged 20-24 are the peak age group for each of the four streams - but migrants from nonmetropolitan to metropolitan areas are more highly concentrated in this age group than are other types of migrants and consequently this is the age at which the net shift out of non-metropolitan areas is greatest. Even here, however, in the aggregate, over half of the migrants to metropolitan areas come from other metropolitan areas.

Table 1. Black population reporting area of residence in 1965 by type of residence at that date, by migration status and age in 1970

Residence in 1965 and age in 1970	Number (in 1000s)	Percent in different place in 1970			Percent of migrants in metropolitan area in 1970
		Total	In metropolitan area	In nonmetropolitan area	
Total, 5 years & over	18,265	9.0	6.3	2.7	69.9
All metropolitan areas:	13,165	7.1	5.3	1.8	74.8
3,000,000 or more	4,533	4.8	3.6	1.2	74.5
1,000,000-3,000,000	3,959	6.3	4.5	1.7	72.4
500,000-1,000,000	1,911	8.6	6.6	2.0	76.9
250,000-500,000	1,528	9.9	7.5	2.4	76.1
50,000-250,000	1,234	12.1	9.1	2.9	75.6
All nonmetropolitan areas	5,099	13.9	8.9	5.1	63.6
20,000-50,000	689	16.7	10.4	6.3	62.1
Less than 20,000	4,410	13.5	8.6	4.9	63.9
5-9 years, total	2,454	8.8	6.2	2.6	70.6
Metropolitan area	1,754	6.9	5.4	1.5	77.9
Nonmetropolitan area	700	13.5	8.3	5.2	61.2
10-14 years, total	2,581	6.7	4.5	2.2	67.8
Metropolitan area	1,836	5.2	3.9	1.2	76.0
Nonmetropolitan area	755	10.3	5.9	4.4	57.7
15-19 years, total	2,222	10.0	6.6	3.3	66.5
Metropolitan area	1,530	7.8	5.3	2.4	68.9
Nonmetropolitan area	693	14.8	9.5	5.4	63.8
20-24 years, total	1,524	22.4	16.5	5.9	73.7
Metropolitan area	1,079	16.9	12.6	4.3	74.4
Nonmetropolitan area	445	35.6	26.0	9.6	73.0
25-29 years, total	1,214	17.3	13.1	4.3	75.5
Metropolitan area	921	13.9	11.0	2.9	79.3
Nonmetropolitan area	293	28.3	19.6	8.6	69.5
30-34 years, total	1,106	11.3	8.3	3.0	73.2
Metropolitan area	859	9.3	7.3	2.0	78.9
Nonmetropolitan area	247	18.4	11.7	6.7	63.3
35-44 years, total	2,191	7.2	4.9	2.2	68.9
Metropolitan area	1,690	5.7	4.3	1.4	75.2
Nonmetropolitan area	501	11.9	7.0	4.9	58.8

Table 1. (continued)

Residence in 1965 and age in 1970	Number (in 1000s)	Percent in different place in 1970			Percent of migrants in metropolitan area in 1970
		Total	In metropolitan area	In nonmetropolitan area	
45-54 years, total	1,960	4.4	2.8	1.6	64.4
Metropolitan area	1,464	3.4	2.4	0.9	72.3
Nonmetropolitan area	496	7.5	4.1	3.5	54.1
55-64 years, total	1,525	3.5	2.1	1.4	60.0
Metropolitan area	1,075	2.7	1.8	0.9	66.6
Nonmetropolitan area	450	5.2	2.7	2.5	51.8
65 years and over	1,488	3.9	2.2	1.6	57.7
Metropolitan area	968	3.0	1.9	1.1	64.0
Nonmetropolitan area	519	5.5	2.8	2.7	51.2

Notes: Excludes persons abroad or not reporting place of residence in 1965. Individual figures may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970, Subject Reports Final Report PC (2)-2C, Mobility for Metropolitan Areas, Tables 8-14.

A particularly interesting aspect of the metropolitan-nonmetropolitan origin of migrants to metropolitan areas, however, is the difference between those aged 20-24 and those aged 25-29, the two age groups in which rates of migration are highest. In 1970, 54 percent of the in-migrants to metropolitan areas who were 20-24 years of age at that date came from other metropolitan areas; for those 25-29, the proportion was 64 percent. Again, the comparative data available for the 32 areas indicate that the same pattern prevailed, at lower levels, in 1960 and that the differences between the Southern and non-Southern SMSAs are diminishing.

Percent of in-migrants aged 20-24 and 25-29 resident in metropolitan area 5 years prior to Census (unweighted averages)

Residence at Census date	Age at Census date: 1960 (Total, except White) 20-24	1960 (Total, except White) 25-29	1970 (Black) 20-24	1970 (Black) 25-29
All metropolitan areas	N.A.	N.A.	54.0(a)	63.8(a)
32 metropolitan areas	37.9	48.9	50.7	62.3
6 Northeastern areas	43.7	55.0	56.5	70.0
10 North Central areas	41.1	54.7	51.8	64.1
14 Southern areas	29.8	38.8	44.7	55.1
2 Western areas	61.6	71.7	69.8	80.3

Source: Appendix Table IV
(a) Weighted averages

Certain factors - for example, migration associated with military service or schooling - probably explain a part of this consistent difference between those aged 20-24 and those aged 25-29, but they do not account for the major portion. Rather, one may hypothesize that these differences reflect the continuing role of "step-migration," described by DuBois 75 years ago: the older group includes many persons who are migrating for at least the second time and this second migration is more likely to be from one metropolitan area to another. Later on in this paper we will look at other indirect evidence of this phenomenon of "remigration". We might note here, however, that this suggestion that persons who move once are likely to

Table 2. Age of black population by metropolitan-nonmetropolitan residence in 1970, migration status, and type of residence in 1965

Age in 1970	Living in metropolitan area in 1970				Living in nonmetropolitan area in 1970			
		Migrants, 1965-70				Migrants, 1965-70		
	Nonmigrants	Total	From other metropolitan area	From nonmetropolitan area	Nonmigrants	Total	From metropolitan area	From other nonmetropolitan area
Total, 5 years of age and over (in 1000s)	12,236	1,147	695	452	4,389	493	234	259
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
5-14	27.5	23.5	24.0	22.7	29.2	24.2	21.2	26.9
15-24	18.9	34.7	31.3	40.1	20.0	33.2	35.7	30.9
25-34	12.8	21.9	23.6	19.1	9.4	17.3	18.5	16.2
35 and over	40.8	19.9	21.1	18.2	41.4	25.4	24.7	25.9

Notes: see Table 1.

Source: see Table 1.

Table 3. Percent of black population completing high school or higher educational levels, by metropolitan-nonmetropolitan residence in 1970, migration status, and type of residence in 1965, by age in 1970

Age in 1970	Living in metropolitan area in 1970				Living in nonmetropolitan area in 1970			
		Migrants, 1965-70				Migrants, 1965-70		
	Nonmigrants	Total	From other metropolitan area	From nonmetropolitan area	Nonmigrants	Total	From metropolitan area	From other nonmetropolitan area
25 years of age and over	34.3	52.3	57.1	43.4	16.8	33.2	39.7	27.1
25-34	54.3	66.2	70.1	59.0	34.2	49.0	54.5	43.3
35-44	41.5	49.4	54.6	38.5	22.2	33.5	41.1	26.1
45-64	25.3	29.2	34.2	20.8	11.9	17.8	23.1	13.5
65 and over	12.5	17.0	20.3	12.7	5.9	10.1	12.7	8.1

Notes: see Table 1.

Source: see Table 1.

move a second time is in accordance with knowledge about the behavior of migrants in general. If the ties to a home community are broken once, they are apparently more easy to break a second time.

As mentioned, the concentration of migrants in the young adult ages is virtually universal. Although there are differences in age distribution among the four migration streams we are looking at, in all four the concentration in ages 15-34 is substantially greater than for the nonmigrant populations (Table 2).

b. Education: A second, although somewhat less firmly established generalization about migrants is that those who leave an area will generally have higher levels of educational attainment than those who remain, that is, to use the demographer's terminology, that migrants are positively selected for education. Educational levels in rural, nonmetropolitan areas, however, are generally lower than those in urban metropolitan places. Consequently, in the mass rural to urban movements that occur, migrants, even though on the average they may be better educated than those they leave behind, are likely to be educationally disadvantaged in their urban destination. This has apparently been the situation in the past for blacks in the United States. DuBois notes the educational lacks of the migrants to Philadelphia in many places in his study and a number of more recent investigations support this finding.[5]

Unfortunately, for our present purposes, Census data on the educational attainment of migrants deal only with persons aged 25 years and over, an age limitation that eliminates the group where, as we have seen, rates of migration are highest. But the pattern of differences is so striking and so consistent for these older age groups that the possibility of its being reversed for younger age groups seems very unlikely.

Using the proportions of population that have completed high school (or higher

levels of education) as our measure, we find that the now dominant migrant stream, persons moving from one metropolitan area to another, have for every age group far higher educational attainment than nonmigrants or than any of the other migrant streams (Table 3). For example, among persons aged 25-34, 70 percent of the inter-metropolitan stream have completed high school, as compared with only 54 percent among nonmigrants living in SMSAs and 52 percent for the total black population in this age group in 1970. Since, for this age group, those moving from non-metropolitan to metropolitan areas also have higher than average proportions in the upper educational category - 59 percent - it seems certain that on balance the metropolitan black population as a whole gained persons of higher educational status through the process of migration in the 1965-1970 period.

Whether this is true for a specific metropolitan area, of course, depends on the balance between the immigrants it gains and the out-migrants it loses. For DuBois' Philadelphia, or at least its modern version, the Philadelphia SMSA, the pattern of differences between migrants and nonmigrants and among in-migrants and out-migrants with the possible origins and destinations, is similar to that we have just described. Both those who came and those who left included substantially higher proportions of high school graduates than those in the area at both dates (Table 6). Unfortunately, the data available for specific metropolitan areas do not permit us to control for age - that is, to look at those aged 25-34, as we have for all metropolitan areas in combination. Since the young black population has much higher educational levels, and the migrants, as we have seen, are concentrated in the younger ages, we cannot be sure how much of the difference between migrants and nonmigrants is owing to the "age-effect." In sum, the educational attainment of those who left Philadelphia was higher than of those who came to the area. But since more came than left, there was in fact no net effect on the total

educational level of Philadelphia's black population, or at least those 25 years of age and over, from those interchanges.

For Atlanta, the other metropolitan area of special interest to this audience, the situation is essentially the same except that, based on the measure of high school completion, those who came to Atlanta included slightly higher proportions than those who left (Table 6). We might note, however, that based on a measure of those who had completed four or more years of college, those who left Atlanta and went to another metropolitan area had the highest educational level - 22 percent of this group had completed college, presumably largely representing the exported products of our host institutions. Regardless, however, of whether the net effect in a specific area is negative, positive, or neutral, and regardless of the "age-effect," the point remains that the relative educational status of the majority of black migrants to metropolitan areas now is substantially different from what it was in DuBois' day and from what has been the general impression throughout the period since that time. Persons with educational handicaps do still come to metropolitan areas; but on the average migrants are considerably less handicapped than the non-migrants already there, and the tendency is for those with low educational attainment to become an increasingly small proportion of the in-migrant population.

Some indication of how rapidly this situation has changed may be gained by looking at the comparative data for Philadelphia and Atlanta ten years earlier. For the black population 25 years of age and over in 1960, the pattern of differentials between nonmigrants and in- and out-migrants and among those with metropolitan and nonmetropolitan origins and destinations coming to and leaving each area in the previous five years, is the same as we find for 1970. But the levels

are dramatically different. For Philadelphia, the proportion of in-migrants who had completed high school or higher levels of education rose from 36 percent in the 1955-60 period to 52.5 percent in 1965-70; for Atlanta, the proportion more than doubled - from 25 percent at the earlier date to 53 percent at the more recent period (Table 6).

c. Activity status and occupation: The effect of this relatively high educational status among migrants should of course be reflected in their economic status. This brings us to the last of the characteristics of black migrants that we are going to look at in this paper, the activity status of males in 1970 and the occupation of those who were employed at that date.

It is important to note that in looking at the occupational distribution of the employed we are dealing with only a portion of the total migrants. Even among males in what the Census Bureau defines as the labor force ages, those 16 years of age and older, barely half of the migrants, 52 percent, were working at a civilian job in 1970. Another four percent were looking for work and 16 percent were in the armed forces. The remaining 28 percent were not in the labor force, and unfortunately we know almost nothing about what they were doing, or about their general economic status. Clearly, some were still in school and may have migrated in connection with their schooling; others may have retired and changed their place of residence in connection with retirement; a variety of possibilities can be hypothesized. There is a very considerable difference among the several migration streams, and of course among the several age groups, in the proportions in these various activity status categories - and some of these differences are quite revealing. For example, what we can term "wrong-way" movement in the context of the strong trend towards urbanization, that is, migration from metropolitan to nonmetropolitan areas, turns out to be by far the least "job-oriented" migration of the types we

Table 4. Activity status of black males in 1970, by metropolitan-nonmetropolitan residence, migration status, and type of residence in 1965, by age in 1970

Age and activity status in 1970	Living in metropolitan area in 1970				Living in nonmetropolitan area in 1970			
		Migrants, 1965-70				Migrants, 1965-70		
	Nonmigrants	Total	From other metropolitan area	From nonmetropolitan area	Nonmigrants	Total	From metropolitan area	From other nonmetropolitan area
Males, 16 years of age and over (in 1000s)	3,816	422	263	159	1,353	201	108	93
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employed	66.6	56.5	53.5	61.6	60.3	41.4	31.1	53.5
Unemployed	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.7	3.7	3.0	2.6	3.5
Civilian labor force	71.1	61.2	58.2	66.3	64.0	44.4	33.7	56.9
Armed forces	0.5	16.1	18.1	12.8	0.3	16.7	22.0	10.5
Not in labor force	28.5	22.7	23.7	21.0	35.7	38.9	44.3	32.5
Males, 16-24 (in 1000s)	902	183	106	77	355	89	52	37
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employed	43.3	42.2	34.1	53.4	42.5	25.3	16.7	37.3
Unemployed	8.0	4.9	4.6	5.5	5.8	2.3	1.9	4.2
Civilian labor force	51.3	47.1	38.7	58.8	48.4	28.1	18.6	41.5
Armed forces	0.7	25.8	31.5	18.0	0.4	28.5	35.0	19.5
Not in labor force	48.0	27.1	29.9	23.2	51.3	43.3	46.4	39.1
Males, 25-34 (in 1000s)	671	128	84	44	185	46	25	21
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employed	84.1	72.5	70.4	76.5	84.2	58.8	46.4	73.0
Unemployed	4.8	4.6	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.2	3.2	3.1
Civilian labor force	88.9	77.1	75.4	80.4	88.2	61.9	49.6	76.1
Armed forces	0.8	10.3	10.8	9.3	0.5	11.2	14.7	7.3
Not in labor force	10.3	12.6	13.8	10.2	11.2	26.8	35.7	16.6
Males, 35 years and over (in 1000s)	2,243	111	73	38	814	66	32	34
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employed	70.6	61.7	62.2	60.9	62.6	51.0	42.7	58.7
Unemployed	3.0	4.5	4.7	4.0	2.8	3.1	3.2	2.9
Civilian labor force	73.7	66.2	66.9	64.9	65.4	54.1	46.0	61.6
Armed forces	0.3	6.7	7.0	6.2	0.2	4.7	6.6	2.9
Not in labor force	26.0	27.1	26.1	28.9	34.5	41.3	47.5	35.5

Notes: see Table 1.

Source: see Table 1.

are studying here: 22 percent of the adult males making this type of move were in the army in 1970, and another 44 percent were out of the labor force entirely; only 34 percent were working or looking for work in the civilian job market (Table 4). The complementary stream, those moving from nonmetropolitan to metropolitan areas, is almost directly opposite - 13 percent were in the army, 21 percent were out of the labor force, and 66 percent were working or looking for work. I might note that this difference between "rural-to-urban" and "urban-to-rural" migrants also occurs for the white population of the United States and can be observed in other countries as well. In the aggregate, it seems to be generally true that urban areas import economically active persons from rural communities and export to those communities persons less likely to be engaged in such activity. This, of course, is true only in terms of relative proportions. As we shall see when we look at the occupation data, those who make this "reverse" migration and are employed, are likely to have higher than average occupational status.

These differences between migrants to metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas in the proportions neither working nor looking for work are in part a reflection of the differences in age distribution that we have already looked at. Migrants to nonmetropolitan areas include a higher proportion of older persons than do those going to metropolitan areas. But even when we look at the data for specific age groups, the difference remains: among those aged 16-24, 46 percent of those who left a metropolitan residence and went to a non-metropolitan area were out of the labor force in 1970, but only 23 percent of those making the opposite journey were inactive. My guess is that a substantial part of these "nonactive" young migrants were moving in connection with further schooling. People go to metropolitan areas also, of course, to attend a college or university. But it is perhaps easier for those attending college in a large metropolitan center to find at least part time

work, and therefore to be counted as part of the labor force, than it is for those at colleges in small towns and rural areas.

At any rate, as a result of the substantial proportion of migrants who are inactive in the labor market, the relative occupational level of employed males does not really give us a comprehensive measure of the economic status of all migrants. Moreover, the occupation data available to us - that is, occupation in 1970 - cannot be interpreted as a measure of migrant selectivity in the way that the previous characteristics, age and education, can be. We know the age of migrants before they made the move we are examining - they were all five years younger than they were in 1970 - and we can be pretty sure that the great majority of persons 25 years of age and over in 1970 who had completed high school must have completed this level of education by 1965, that is, before they made the move. But we have no knowledge at present of the activity status or occupation of either migrants or nonmigrants in 1965. We cannot therefore say with any precision whether the differences we observe are stable characteristics of the people involved, or an inherent part of the move itself. Nevertheless, the differentials are useful in giving some indication of the relative economic status in 1970 of at least this portion of the migrants.

The most commonly used single measure of relative occupational status when one has, as here, only very broad major occupational groups available, is the percent of the employed who are in the so-called white-collar occupations, that is, professional, technical, managerial, sales, and clerical workers. By this measure, our findings here reinforce those indicated by the education data: for both metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas, the proportion of employed in-migrants in white collar occupations is higher than that for nonmigrants in these areas, in general and for each specific age group (Table 5). Within the white collar occupations,

Table 5. Broad occupation group of black males employed in 1970, by metropolitan-nonmetropolitan residence, migration status, and type of residence in 1965, by age in 1970

Age and occupation in 1970	Living in metropolitan area in 1970				Living in nonmetropolitan area in 1970			
		Migrants, 1965-70				Migrants, 1965-70		
	Nonmigrants	Total	From other metropolitan area	From nonmetropolitan area	Nonmigrants	Total	From metropolitan area	From other nonmetropolitan area
Males, 16 years of age and over (in 1000s)	2,540	238	141	98	816	83	34	50
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White collar	21.0	30.6	35.8	23.2	8.5	17.2	22.3	13.8
Blue collar	60.1	54.4	49.4	61.5	64.4	60.2	57.3	62.1
Farm workers	1.3	1.1	0.7	1.5	14.8	11.1	7.6	13.5
Service workers	17.6	13.9	14.1	13.7	12.2	11.5	12.8	10.6
Males, 16-24 (in 1000s)	390	77	36	41	151	22	9	14
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White collar	24.9	28.4	35.4	22.2	7.5	17.3	23.9	13.1
Blue collar	55.1	55.3	47.8	61.9	68.1	59.0	55.3	61.2
Farm workers	1.2	0.8	0.5	1.1	12.0	9.5	5.3	12.1
Service workers	18.7	15.6	16.3	14.9	12.4	14.3	15.5	13.5
Males, 25-34 (in 1000s)	565	93	59	33	156	27	11	16
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White collar	23.8	35.2	39.6	27.5	9.5	21.1	26.5	17.9
Blue collar	62.0	54.1	49.7	62.0	70.8	63.7	59.5	66.7
Farm workers	0.9	0.7	0.5	1.1	11.2	7.6	5.4	9.3
Service workers	13.2	9.9	10.3	9.3	8.5	7.6	9.6	6.2
Males, 35 years and over (in 1000s)	1,584	68	45	23	509	34	14	20
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White collar	19.1	27.0	31.2	18.9	8.6	14.0	18.5	11.0
Blue collar	60.6	53.6	50.3	60.1	61.4	58.2	56.8	59.2
Farm workers	1.4	1.9	1.3	3.0	16.7	15.0	10.8	17.8
Service workers	18.9	17.5	17.3	18.0	13.3	12.8	13.9	12.0

Notes: see Table 1.

Source: see Table 1.

the differences are particularly striking for professional and technical workers, where in each instance, the proportion is two or three times higher among migrants than it is among nonmigrants.

As we would expect in light of our earlier discussion of educational levels, by far the highest proportion of white collar workers is found among employed migrants who have moved from one metropolitan area to another: 36 percent of these men were in white collar jobs, almost half in professional and technical occupations. In fact, the generally close relationship between differentials in the two series is indicated by the following comparisons.

1965/1970 residence status	Persons aged 25-34		Persons aged 35 or over	
	% of employed males in white collar occupations	% of persons (both sexes) completing high school or higher educational levels	% of employed males in white collar occupations	% of persons (both sexes) completing high school or higher educational levels
Moved between metropolitan areas	39.6	70.1	31.2	42.8
Moved from a non-metropolitan area to a metropolitan area	27.5	59.0	18.9	26.9
Moved from a metropolitan area to a nonmetropolitan area	25.5	54.5	18.5	28.7
Moved between non-metropolitan areas	17.9	43.3	11.0	17.0
Remained in the same metropolitan area	23.8	54.3	19.1	28.0
Remained in the same nonmetropolitan area	9.5	34.2	8.6	12.8

Source: Tables 3 and 5.

In each of the four columns, migrants between metropolitan areas, "out-score", to use a rather unsatisfactory term, all other categories by a substantial margin;

in intermediate place are the metropolitan-nonmetropolitan and nonmetropolitan-metropolitan interchanges, as well as nonmigrants in metropolitan areas; there is a second substantial drop to the levels for migrants between nonmetropolitan areas; and finally, these indices are lowest for those living in the same nonmetropolitan area at both dates.

This same pattern of differences among the residence categories occurs in the proportions of white collar workers among employed males aged 16-24, the group for which we have no measure of educational attainment. Presumably, therefore, we would be fairly safe in assuming that differences in educational level for these young men are likely to parallel those for the older ages.

Aggregate differences of the type we have been discussing for the occupational differentials are, of course, very interesting and important. But they frequently conceal considerable variability among the individual items of which they represent the average. In the present instance, that is, with regard to the occupational differentials among nonmigrants, intermetropolitan migrants, and migrants from nonmetropolitan to metropolitan areas, however, this is not true. For each of the 32 metropolitan areas whose black populations exceeded 100,000 in 1970, the proportion of white collar workers among employed black men was higher among those who had moved to the area within the previous five years than among those who had been living in the area in both 1965 and 1970, and higher among those who had come from another metropolitan area than among those who had come from a nonmetropolitan area. In a very few cases, the differences are minimal; but in most they are substantial.

3. Summary

We started this section of the paper by noting that black migrants to metropolitan areas now come predominantly from other metropolitan areas and that the major

Table 6. Selected characteristics of the black populations of the Atlanta and Philadelphia metropolitan areas, by migration status and type of origin and destination of migrants, 1960 and 1970

Characteristics, area, and census date	In-migrants[b]			Nonmigrants[c]	Out-migrants[d]		
	Total	From other metropolitan area	From nonmetropolitan area		Total	To other metropolitan area	To nonmetropolitan area
Education, persons 25 years and over							
Percent completing 4 years of high school or more:							
Atlanta, 1960	25.4	33.5	20.7	18.8	31.4	37.6	23.3
Atlanta, 1970	52.8	58.6	46.4	30.7	48.6	57.0	34.0
Philadelphia, 1960	36.1	41.0	29.0	22.6	39.4	43.0	29.9
Philadelphia, 1970	52.5	54.6	47.4	32.7	56.7	61.0	41.9
Percent completing 4 years of college or more:							
Atlanta, 1960	8.9	12.8	6.7	3.1	9.8	11.8	7.2
Atlanta, 1970	16.0	17.2	14.7	5.3	17.5	21.9	10.0
Philadelphia, 1960	8.7	10.9	5.7	2.6	8.2	9.7	4.6
Philadelphia, 1970	11.9	12.7	10.1	3.5	12.2	13.9	6.4
Activity status, civilian males, 16 years of age and over							
Percent in labor force:							
Atlanta, 1960	66.5	50.7	74.5	74.1	58.8	71.8	44.2
Atlanta, 1970	77.8	72.5	82.4	74.6	57.8	71.6	39.9
Philadelphia, 1960	77.7	74.2	81.5	74.7	61.8	68.4	44.8
Philadelphia, 1970	76.1	73.9	80.8	72.3	67.7	72.3	51.7
Occupation, employed males, 16 years of age and over							
Percent white collar:							
Atlanta, 1960	13.6	23.7	10.1	11.3	23.5	26.6	18.0
Atlanta, 1970	33.2	38.4	29.2	20.9	38.2	44.5	23.9
Philadelphia, 1960	19.7	26.8	12.8	16.6	24.2	25.8	17.7
Philadelphia, 1970	32.4	37.8	22.4	22.1	42.0	46.4	20.7

Notes: [a]Data for 1960 include blacks and other races, except white.

[b]In-migrants: persons living in area at census date, elsewhere 5 years earlier.

[c]Nonmigrants: persons living in area at census date and 5 years earlier.

[d]Out-migrants: living in area 5 years before census, elsewhere at census date. Excludes persons abroad or not reporting place of residence 5 years before census.

Sources: 1970: same as Table 1, Tables 15 and 16; 1960: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1960, Subject Reports, Mobility for Metropolitan Areas, Final Report PC(2)-2C, Tables 4-6.

stream of black migration is now from one metropolitan area to another. And we asked the significance of this observation for the nature of black migration. We can now, I believe, feel fairly safe in answering that question - the description of the average black migrant to the city as an ill-trained person of rural background and low socio-economic status to whom the social problems of our large metropolitan areas can be largely attributed will not hold. He or she is in fact well educated by current standards and judging from the occupational position of those employed, relatively successful at utilizing this education.

III. Interstate migration and "multiple movers"

Earlier in this paper, questions were raised on the role played by "remigration", specifically on whether signficant numbers of migrants moved first from rural to metropolitan areas within the South, and then made subsequent moves from Southern to non-Southern metropolitan areas or, in the most recent period, to other Southern areas. Noting the sharp differences between those 20-24 and those 25-29 in the proportions of migrants to metropolitan areas with a nonmetropolitan origin, we hypothesized that this might be further evidence that a considerable amount of "remigration" occurs, that is, that many of those who made an initial move from a nonmetropolitan to a metropolitan area in the younger age group, made a subsequent move to a second metropolitan area later on.

We have another set of data from the censuses of population which again, unfortunately, does not throw any light on the interregional dimensions of this hypothesis, but does provide some indication of the extent of second moves. This is the series that compares a person's state of residence at three points in time, at birth, at a date five years prior to the census, and at the census date. And what these data show is that beyond the age of 25, most black migrants in the period 1965-70 were moving for at least the second time; that is, migrants who left their state of

birth between 1965 and 1970 constitute a minority of total migrants. The same observation can be made for persons over 30 in the 1955-1960 period, but the differences are less striking, so we can tentatively conclude that we have here a trend towards the increasing importance of this type of migration (Table 7).

Some of these persons who are moving for at least the second time are returning to their state of birth. Overall, most are not, that is, most of these "remigrants", to use a rather awkward term, are moving to a third state. But rather interestingly, the "return" migrants, those living outside of their state of birth five years before the census, but back in it by the census date, are a higher proportion of the total in the more recent period than they were in the 1955-1960 interval. Whether this indicates the beginning of a trend for increasing proportions of the black population to return to the South - a possibility that has recently received some attention in the press - we cannot really say from the data at hand. But it is certainly suggestive of this.

Concentrating our attention on the two age groups we looked at earlier, those aged 20-24 and 25-29 in 1970, we see that by this measure also, that is, movement between states, rates of migration are highest at these ages, as they were when we were examining movement between places. More pertinent to the point we are interested in here, however, is the evidence that the nature of migration changes sharply between these two adjacent age groups. We have just noted that past the age of 25, in 1970, most black migrants were changing their state of residence for at least the second time; now we add to that the fact that the change in relative proportions in the two types of migration is particularly sharp specifically at the age of 25, for both decades.

We have then this further indirect evidence that the step-migration DuBois' found 70 years ago is probably still continuing. But we also have from this second

Table 7. Percent of native black population living in different state 5 years prior to Census, by type of move and age at Census date, 1960 and 1970

Age at census date	Native population (in 1000s)[a]	Percent changing state of residence in previous 5 years				
		Total	Leaving state of birth	Leaving a different state		
				Total	Moving to third state	Returning to state of birth
1960, persons 5 years of age and over[b]	16,080	6.3	3.8	2.5	1.6	0.9
5-14	4,521	5.0	3.6	1.4	0.7	0.8
15-19	1,535	7.0	5.2	1.9	1.1	0.7
20-24	1,187	16.7	11.9	4.8	3.3	1.5
25-29	1,141	12.9	6.8	6.1	4.1	2.0
30-34	1,207	8.2	3.8	4.4	3.0	1.4
35-44	2,283	5.1	2.2	2.9	2.0	0.9
45 years and over	4,206	2.8	1.2	1.6	1.1	0.5
1970, persons 5 years of age and over	17,340	6.6	3.5	3.1	1.7	1.4
5-14	4,840	5.6	3.4	2.2	0.9	1.3
15-19	2,136	6.5	4.3	2.2	1.1	1.2
20-24	1,471	16.8	11.1	5.7	3.1	2.6
25-29	1,166	13.9	6.0	7.9	4.7	3.2
30-34	1,047	9.0	3.2	5.8	3.7	2.1
35-44	2,064	5.4	1.8	3.6	2.3	1.3
45 years and over	4,615	2.6	0.9	1.7	1.0	0.7

Notes: [a] Excludes persons not reporting state of birth or state of prior residence and persons born outside the United States or resident outside 5 years prior to the Census.

[b] Data for 1960 includes, in addition to the black population, persons of other races, except white.

Individual figures may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970, Subject Reports, Final Report PC(2)-2D, Lifetime and Recent Migration, Table 1; _____, Census of Population: 1960, Subject Reports, Lifetime and Recent Migration, Final Report PC(2)-2D, Table

migration series, as well as from the first, evidence that the characteristics of the people who migrate have changed dramatically and, moreover, that within the migrant group these characteristics vary systematically with the type of move. Among interstate migrants, the proportions with higher educational attainment and, for the employed, with white collar jobs, are consistently above the levels for nonmigrants (Table 8). But, as we found before that the highest levels of all occurred among those moving from one metropolitan area to another, so we find here that the highest levels are found among those who are moving to at least their third state of residence.

A particularly interesting aspect of these data are the differences among those who moved to a third state in the 1965-70 interval and those who returned to their home state. The higher his or her educational level, the more likely the migrant is to move on to a third state and the less likely he or she is to return home.

iv. Conclusions and implications

We do not have at present the tabulations that would link the data from these two series. But I think we are quite safe in assuming that the evidence they present can be treated together in a discussion of the significance of the present picture. And I would like to present to you the hypothesis that the experience of the black population in the United States has a wider application, that is, that it may be giving us a preview, an indication of what is likely to be the experience in the less developed countries of the world as great numbers of their rural populations move out of an agricultural setting in the continuing process of urbanization. The movement of the black population to the cities of this country differs, on the surface, from the situation in the less developed world because it took place in a developed country with a rapid rate of economic growth. But I believe that this difference in setting is essentially superficial - the situation of the black popula-

Table 8. Selected characteristics of native black population by interstate migration status and type of move, 1965-1970.

Age in 1970	In same state, 1965 and 1970	In different state, 1965 and 1970			
		Total	Leaving state of birth	Leaving a different state	
				Total	Moving to third state	Returning to state of birth
Percent completing 4 years of highschool or more:						
Persons 25 years of age and over	30.0	52.8	48.5	55.3	60.2	47.8
25 - 29	53.5	68.7	64.2	72.1	75.4	67.4
30 - 34	47.2	61.4	55.0	65.0	69.0	57.8
35 years and over	23.8	37.9	31.2	41.3	47.4	32.0
Percent employed persons in white collar occupations:						
Males, 16 years of age and over	17.9	29.2	26.5	31.5	36.0	25.6
16 - 24	19.9	27.0	26.2	28.4	33.3	24.3
25 - 34	20.8	33.4	30.4	35.3	38.9	30.4
35 years and over	16.4	25.9	21.1	28.4	33.6	19.8
Females, 16 years of age and over	34.6	54.3	56.5	52.1	56.9	45.7
16 - 24	52.3	62.7	63.5	61.1	67.1	55.3
25 - 34	41.5	57.4	57.8	57.1	62.5	49.4
35 years and over	26.6	36.9	33.2	38.9	43.7	31.5

Note: see note a, Table 7

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970, Subject Reports, Final Report PC(2)-2D, Lifetime and Recent Migration, Tables 2 and 3.

tion was such that it was cut off from this tide of economic development and systematically excluded, to a very considerable extent, from sharing in its economic benefits. Basically then, its position was the same: black people left the land either because of what appeared to be the superior opportunities of the city or because circumstances forced them off -- both factors played an obvious part. The very earliest migrants, those whom DuBois found among the long-time residents of Philadelphia, appear to be a very highly selected group who, probably through extraordinary efforts of their own, achieve a relatively high status in their new community. As the pace of urban-ward movement accelerates, the sharp differences between city and country-side in the educational and training facilities available to the young, manifest themselves in the disadvantaged position of the later migrants. At a third stage, when the rural to urban shift has proceeded to the point where, in fact it is a relatively small part of total migration and when perhaps the differences in educational opportunities between city and country have diminished, the selective role of migration, that is, the fact that migrants are generally, for example, of higher educational status than those they leave behind, emerges again as a distinguishing characteristic in the place of destination, as it had always been in the place of origin.

It seems clear from the evidence of the 1970 Census, that the black population of the United States is now in this third stage. The process of migration in the aggregate is probably much like that DuBois found 75 years ago, with high proportions of those who move once, moving a second or third or even more times. But the characteristics of migrants, their status relative to the populations they join, is now vastly different - where he found, to return to the opening pages of this paper, evidence that "the average of culture and wealth and social efficiency is far lower among inmigrants than natives," we have found evidence that it is now far

higher. And this finding certainly has important policy implications with regard to the impact of migration on our metropolitan areas and on the country in general.

In addition, however, to the significance of this finding with respect to the character of black migration, we also raised the question earlier in this paper of its significance for the role that migration will play in the future of the black population.

Speaking more broadly then, I believe that as the third migration stage we have described develops, increasing proportions of migrants base their decision to move on a wider range of reasons than the purely economic benefits that may accrue. To use Simon Kuznets' term, migration becomes more "consumption-oriented"? Those with the resources to engage in this type of movement are clearly the more affluent members of the group, that is, those with higher educational attainment and those whose occupational-economic status is above the average; and this I think is why those whom we have called "remigrants", that is, persons moving to at least a third state of residence, are the most highly selected, have the highest educational and occupational status, of any of the migrant categories we have looked at.

Obviously, a great deal more work has to be done before we can feel confident that this model describes reality; but it helps to explain a number of anomalies in migration data for the United States. And if it proves to be realistic, it means, to return to our focus on the black population, that in the future, the decision to move and the choice of destination will be less dictated by economic circumstances and will reflect a much greater range of considerations with regard to the relative desirability of areas as places in which to live.

Footnotes

1. W.E.B. DuBois, The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study (1899). First Schocken edition, 1967. Schocken Books, New York, p. 76.

2. E.S. Lee et al., Population Redistribution and Economic Growth, United States, 1870-1950, vol. I, Methodological Considerations and Reference Tables (Philadelphia, Pa.: American Philosophical Society, 1957); H.T. Eldridge and D.S. Thomas, Population Redistribution and Economic Growth, United States, 1870-1950, vol. III, Demographic Analyses and Interrelations (Philadelphia, Pa.: American Philosophical Society, 1964).

3. DuBois, op. cit., p. 80.

4. E.G. Ravenstein, "The Laws of Migration," Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, XLVIII, Part 2 (June, 1885), pp. 167-227.

5. See, for example: D.O. Price, Changing Characteristics of the Negro Population (A 1960 Census Monograph), U.S. Bureau of the Census, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1969, p. 7 and p. 208 ff.; H.S. Shryock, jr. and C.B. Nam, "Educational selectivity of interregional migration," Social Forces, 43:3 (March 1965), pp. 299-310; A.V. Zodgekar and K.S. Seetharam, "Interdivisional migration differentials by education for groups of selected SMSAs, United States, 1960," Demography, 9:4 (November 1972), pp. 683-699.

6. S. Kuznets, "Introduction" to Eldridge and Thomas, op.cit., p. XXVIII-XXIX.

APPENDIX TABLE I

BLACK POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES, BY REGION AND URBAN-RURAL RESIDENCE, AND ESTIMATED NET INTERCENSAL MIGRATION BY REGION, 1900-1970
(In thousands)

Census date	United States	Northeast	North Central	South	West
	Total black population				
1900	8834	385	496	7923	30
1910	9828	484	544	8749	51
1920	10463	679	793	8912	79
1930	11891	1147	1262	9362	120
1940	12866	1370	1420	9905	171
1950[1]	15042	2018	2228	10226	571
1950[2]	15045	2019	2228	10226	572
1960	18872	3028	3446	11312	1086
1970	22580	4344	4572	11970	1695
	Urban black population				
1900	2000	296	319	1365	20
1910	2683	394	395	1854	40
1920	3561	590	661	2249	60
1930	5194	1021	1108	2967	99
1940	6254	1234	1261	3616	142
1950[1]	8959	1852	2040	4614	453
1950[2]	9394	1898	2090	4891	515
1960	13808	2896	3297	6608	1006
1970	18367	4215	4447	8064	1642
	Rural black population				
1900	6834	90	177	6558	10
1910	7145	90	149	6895	11
1920	6902	89	132	6663	19
1930	6697	126	154	6395	21
1940	6612	136	159	6289	29
1950[1]	6083	166	188	5611	118
1950[2]	5651	120	139	5335	57
1960	5064	132	149	4704	80
1970	4213	129	125	3906	53
	Estimated net intercensal migration - Total black population				
1900-1910	- 3	111	63	- 197	20
1910-1920	- 3	212	280	- 525	30
1920-1930	—	409	427	- 877	41
1930-1940	3	203	152	- 407	55
1940-1950[3]	- 4	484	625	- 1468	355
1940-1950[4]	- 180	463	618	- 1599	339
1950-1960	- 131	496	541	- 1473	305
1960-1970	- 85	612	382	- 1380	301

Notes: Urban-rural data for 1900-1950[1] refer to "old" urban definition, for 1950[2]-1970 to "new" urban definition. See U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1950 Bulletin P-C1, U.S. Summary, p. viiif., for discussion of differences.

Net intercensal migration for 1900-1950[3] derived by Census Survival Ratio method, for 1950[4]-1970 by Vital Statistics method. See sources for further discussion.

Sources: 1900-1950[1]: E S Lee et al., Population Redistribution and Economic Growth, Vol. I, Methodological Considerations and Reference Tables, Tables P-4A, P-4B, P-4C;

1950[2]: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1950, Special Report P-E, No. 3B, Table 2;

1960, 1970 from U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970, General Population Characteristics, Final Report PC(1)-B1, United States, Table 55.

1900-1910 to 1940-1950[3]: H. T. Eldridge and D. S. Thomas, Population Redistribution and Economic Growth, Vol. III, Demographic Analyses and Interrelations Table A1.20;

1940-1950[4] to 1960-1970: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Population Estimates and Projections, Series P-25, No. 460 (June 7, 1971), Table 7.

APPENDIX TABLE II

BLACK POPULATION IN METROPOLITAN AREAS, BY REGION, 1900-1970
(In thousands)

Census date	United States	North			South	West
		Total	Northeast	North Central		
		All metropolitan areas				
1900	2352	582	n.a.	n.a.	1750	20
1910	2820	745	n.a.	n.a.	2038	37
1920	3547	1203	n.a.	n.a.	2291	54
1930	4991	2096	n.a.	n.a.	2793	100
1940	5846	2474	n.a.	n.a.	3219	147
1950	8360	3886	n.a.	n.a.	3953	520
1960[1]	12198	6010	n.a.	n.a.	5186	1002
1960[2]	12710	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
1970	16771	8440	4147	4293	6714	1617
		Percent of regional black population in all metropolitan areas in region				
1900	26.6	66.1	n.a.	n.a.	22.1	66.7
1910	28.7	72.5	n.a.	n.a.	23.3	72.5
1920	33.9	81.7	n.a.	n.a.	25.7	68.4
1930	42.0	87.1	n.a.	n.a.	29.8	83.3
1940	45.4	88.7	n.a.	n.a.	32.5	86.0
1950	55.0	91.5	n.a.	n.a.	38.7	91.1
1960[1]	61.6	93.5	n.a.	n.a.	45.8	93.3
1960[2]	67.3	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
1970	74.3	94.7	95.5	93.9	56.1	95.4
		Percent of regional black population in metropolitan areas with 100,000 or more black population in 1970				
1900	14.1	48.2	65.2	35.1	10.2	20.0
1910	15.8	54.9	68.6	42.6	11.1	31.4
1920	20.4	64.7	74.2	56.5	12.9	36.7
1930	27.3	72.1	78.6	66.0	15.1	51.7
1940	30.3	74.8	81.1	68.8	17.3	55.6
1950	39.1	77.7	82.6	73.3	21.6	64.1
1960[1]	46.4	77.6	80.7	74.8	26.8	64.8
1960[2]	47.3	77.7	80.8	75.0	28.4	63.4
1970	53.4	78.0	80.3	75.8	33.5	64.5

Notes: 1900-1960[1] data refer to areas as defined in 1960; 1960[2] data refer to areas as defined in 1970.

Sources:

1900-1960[1]: same as Appendix Table III

1960[2]: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1973. (94th edition). Washington, D.C., 1973, p. 17.

1970: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population:1970, General Population Characteristics. Final Reports PC(1)-B, Table 17 for each state.

APPENDIX TABLE III

BLACK POPULATION IN 34 METROPOLITAN AREAS WITH 100,000 OR MORE BLACKS IN 1970, 1900-1970
(In thousands)

Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960(1)	1960(2)	1970
Total 34 areas	1,242*	1,554*	2,134*	3,241*	3,901*	5,878*	8,761*	8,934*	12,054
6 Northeastern areas	251*	332*	504*	904*	1,111*	1,666*	2,445*	2,448*	3,487
New York	73	107	171	367	515	820	1,228	1,228	1,885
Philadelphia	102	130	191	299	335	480	671	671	844
Newark	18	25	39	81	92	134	224	224	348
Pittsburgh	35	44	68	107	112	126	161	161	170
Boston (a)	21	24	29	33	36	52	78	61	131
Buffalo	2	2	6	17	21	44	83	63	109
10 North Central areas	174*	232*	448*	833*	977*	1,634*	2,576*	2,585*	3,465
Chicago	34	49	119	255	303	536	890	890	1,237
Detroit	5	6	45	138	171	358	559	559	757
St. Louis	49	63	91	128	152	216	295	295	379
Cleveland	6	9	36	75	88	152	257	259	333
Cincinnati	22	28	38	61	69	95	128	130	155
Kansas City	30	38	50	63	67	87	117	117	151
Indianapolis	16	23	36	45	52	65	160	161	137
Gary	-	1	7	24	27	51	87	87	112
Milwaukee	1	1	2	8	9	22	63	63	107
Columbus	9	14	24	36	39	52	80	82	106
16 Southern areas	811*	974*	1,153*	1,442*	1,718*	2,212*	3,036*	3,214*	3,465
Washington D.C.	121	127	141	167	229	336	487	495	704
Baltimore	113	117	136	174	199	271	379	386	490
Houston	20	31	43	73	104	149	246	277	382
New Orleans	86	96	108	139	159	200	267	278	324
Atlanta	61	62	90	127	130	172	225	233	255
Memphis	85	92	99	127	155	180	227	255	289
Dallas	23	38	50	67	78	100	155	166	247
Birmingham	57	91	130	168	179	208	220	231	217
Miami	1	4	13	30	50	65	137	137	190
Norfolk	63	74	96	85	87	122	150	150	168
Richmond	53	61	67	67	74	87	107	114	130
Greensboro	31	35	37	29	32	37	51	103	118
Jacksonville	22	27	48	53	68	82	106	106	118
Mobile	28	35	40	42	52	78	101	111	113
Tampa	11	21	21	40	48	57	89	89	109
Louisville	49	50	48	54	54	66	83	83	101
2 Western areas	6*	16*	29*	62*	95*	366*	704*	688*	1093*
Los Angeles	3	10	19	47	75	219	465	462	763
San Francisco	3	6	10	15	20	147	239	226	330

(a) Data for Boston in 1960(2) and 1970 refer to four counties, Essex, Middlesex, Norfolk, and Suffolk, rather than to the official SMSA definition.

Individual figures may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: 1900-1960(1) from U.S, Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1960. Selected Area Reports. Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas. Final Report PC(3)-1D. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1963; Table 1; all data refer to SMSAs as defined in 1960.

1960(2) from ibid., General Population Characteristics. Final Report PC(1) - Series B, Table 28 for each state; areas as defined in 1970, except Boston (see note (a)).

1970 from U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970. General Population Characteristics. Final Report PC(1) - B 1, United States, Table 67, except Boston (see note (a)).

APPENDIX TABLE IV

PERCENT OF IN-MIGRANTS TO 32 METROPOLITAN AREAS LIVING IN ANOTHER METROPOLITAN AREA 5 YEARS PRIOR TO CENSUS, AND PERCENT OF OUT-MIGRANTS IN PREVIOUS 5 YEARS LIVING IN ANOTHER METROPOLITAN AREA AT CENSUS DATE, BY AGE AT CENSUS DATE BLACKS AND OTHER (EXCEPT WHITES) 1960 AND BLACKS, 1970[a]

Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area	Percent migrants from other metropolitan areas						Percent out-migrants to other metropolitan areas	
	Persons aged 5 and over		Persons aged 20-24		Persons aged 25-29		Persons aged 5 and over	
	1960	1970	1960	1970	1960	1970	1960	1970
32 areas (b)	42.7	50.1	37.9	50.7	48.9	61.9	67.0	73.7
6 Northeastern areas (b)	53.8	64.4	43.7	56.5	55.0	70.0	69.1	75.1
New York	46.8	56.4	37.5	48.6	52.0	65.9	65.6	68.8
Philadelphia	53.7	67.8	45.6	60.4	55.5	66.3	69.8	76.3
Newark	46.0	59.9	37.7	44.1	50.2	63.5	61.5	62.4
Pittsburgh	57.6	74.4	42.5	71.0	58.7	77.0	72.7	84.7
Boston	61.3	66.4	53.5	59.0	66.6	73.8	76.8	81.9
Buffalo	53.4	59.2	45.4	55.7	52.4	73.2	68.5	76.5
10 North Central areas (b)	50.7	61.0	41.1	51.8	54.7	63.1	69.4	76.2
Chicago	44.0	49.4	35.6	41.5	49.3	53.3	66.3	70.6
Detroit	56.6	66.7	40.8	57.4	62.2	69.8	73.7	79.0
St. Louis	41.1	50.3	34.8	41.3	49.2	62.0	71.6	68.6
Cleveland	56.2	65.5	43.6	59.6	56.6	70.3	70.5	80.2
Cincinnati	58.9	73.1	42.9	62.4	57.8	77.6	71.1	83.7
Kansas City	43.2	52.7	34.4	40.6	50.5	52.3	72.6	73.2
Indianapolis	41.5	66.6	35.4	57.8	46.8	63.5	63.6	77.5
Gary	61.3	62.0	47.2	51.9	57.4	63.3	72.1	79.6
Milwaukee	46.6	56.7	37.7	46.4	53.3	60.5	66.6	68.9
Columbus	54.5	66.2	52.2	57.8	64.2	68.4	65.6	81.1
14 Southern areas (b)	37.3	45.3	29.0	44.1	36.0	49.1	64.5	72.5
Washington D.C.	41.6	51.2	34.6	55.7	41.0	52.1	67.2	72.8
Baltimore	43.7	62.7	36.1	52.1	41.7	67.1	64.0	69.2
Houston	34.2	51.9	25.2	40.9	40.7	54.6	61.9	64.9
New Orleans	28.5	40.3	20.1	30.0	35.1	46.6	67.2	62.0
Atlanta	29.4	45.4	25.2	37.9	34.4	50.6	57.7	60.4
Memphis	19.5	31.3	16.0	27.0	25.8	46.3	71.9	77.7
Dallas	34.1	52.2	26.4	44.2	39.4	56.0	67.8	68.3
Birmingham	34.4	50.1	26.9	43.0	41.2	63.7	75.4	84.6
Miami	32.5	50.4	25.9	42.9	35.8	52.0	57.1	66.5
Norfolk	45.4	57.4	33.0	52.0	42.9	63.3	64.1	76.5
Richmond	33.2	46.3	21.5	42.0	36.5	52.0	58.2	66.8
Jacksonville Fla.	37.8	57.7	34.3	59.2	42.8	58.2	56.5	71.6
Tampa	32.0	50.6	22.5	45.3	36.9	53.4	51.0	67.0
Louisville	42.0	51.5	30.2	43.6	36.6	42.0	62.6	68.2
2 Western areas (b)	70.0	77.4	61.6	69.8	71.7	80.3	76.6	84.0
Los Angeles	71.6	77.2	62.7	69.4	71.4	79.0	77.7	84.1
San Francisco	68.3	77.5	60.6	70.1	72.0	81.6	75.4	83.9

Notes: data for 1960 refer to areas as defined in 1960, for 1970 as defined in 1970. In most areas there was either no change in definition or the effect of the change on the black population was minimal. Comparison of 1960^1 and 1960^2 columns in Appendix Table III shows effect of change on total black population.

(a) The change in coverage may affect comparisons for the two Western areas; in all other areas "others" are a very minor proportion of total.

(b) Unweighted average.

Sources: same as Table 6.